

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/756,956	01/09/2001	James D. Cliver	2960	6176	
75	11/18/2003		EXAMINER		
Terry T. Moyer			KUMAR, PREETI		
P. O. Box 1927 Spartanburg, Se			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
G F			1751 DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003		
		<u>.</u>			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· •				M				
	Application I	No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/756,956		CLIVER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examin r	·	Art Unit					
	Preeti Kuma		1751					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the co	over sheet with the c	orrespond nce add	ress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep- if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	.136(a). In no event, only within the statutory will apply and will extended to the application.	however, may a reply be tim y minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONEC	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this con (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10.5	September 200	<u>3</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	s action is non-	final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application	n.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requ	urement.						
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin								
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac		•						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the				2.4.4047.15				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	·							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xammer. Note	the attached Office	ACTION OF IONIN PTC	J- 15Z.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		- 05 II O O S 440/s						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes and the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for document in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for document in the first sentence of the priority document in the first sente	nts have been rorts have been rority documents au (PCT Rule 1 of the certified its priority underst sentence of rovisional applicatic priority underst.	eceived. eceived in Application s have been received 7.2(a)). d copies not receive er 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) the specification or cation has been receive er 35 U.S.C. §§ 120	on No d in this National S d. e) (to a provisional a in an Application E eived. and/or 121 since a	application) Data Sheet.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413) Papar Na(a)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5)	Notice of Informal P Other:						

*

Application/Control Number: 09/756,956 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 pending.

Response to Amendment

- 2. The rejection of claims 1-8, 17, 20, 22, 25-26, 28, 30, 34, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenshaw (US 5,861,044), and further in view of Bouwknegt et al. (US 4,859,207) is maintained for the reasons recited in the previous office action dated April 8, 2003 in paper no. 7.
- 3. Claims 21 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. as applied to claims 1-8, 17, 20, 22, 25-26, 28, 30, 34, and 36-37 above and further, in view of Hauser et al. (US 5,667,533).
- 4. Claims 3,4,6,9,14,16,27,29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. as applied to claims 1-8, 17, 20, 22, 25-26, 28, 30, 34,and 36-37 above and further, in view of Egli et al. (US 3,743,477).
- 5. Claims 10-13, 15, 18-19, 23-24, 32-33, and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. as applied to claims 1-9, 14, 16-17, 20, 22, 25-31, 34, and 36-37 above, and further in view of Fadler nee Jack et al. (US 4,023,925).

Response to Arguments

- 6. Applicant's arguments filed September 10, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 7. Regarding the rejection of Crenshaw in view of Bouwknegt et al., Applicant's urge that the prior art does not teach a patterned effect using a physical bonding

Application/Control Number: 09/756,956 Page 3

Art Unit: 1751

mechanism that prevent the treated region of the fabric from becoming fully saturated while exposing substantially the entire fabric to the dye. Instead the prior art teaches a chemical reaction to achieve the patterned effect. Regarding the rejection of Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. in view of Hauser et al., Applicants urge that Hauser et al. teach a chemical bonding to cellulosic fibers to create a heather appearance. Regarding the rejection of Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. in view of Fadler nee Jack et al., Applicants urge that Fadler nee Jack et al. do not teach a mechanical inhibition of dyes.

- 8. However, Applicant's have not disclosed what portion of the prior art (column, line #) is relied upon to come to the conclusion that the teachings in the prior art are chemical reactions and furthermore it is not seen how the instant claims are limited to only mechanical reactions or physical bonding reactions. Thus, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.
- 9. Specifically Regarding the rejection of Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. in view of Egli et al., Applicants argu hindsight reasoning. However, it is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, to utilize an alginate print paste and disperse dyes in the process taught by Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al., because Egli et al. teach the utility of alginate print pastes and disperse dyes in the dyeing process and further, Crenshaw and Bouwknegt et al. teach the utility of various methods of dyeing in general.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/756,956 Page 4

Art Unit: 1751

10. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Preeti Kumar whose telephone number is 703-305-

0178. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 703-308-4708. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-872-

9309.

YQGENDRAIN. GUPTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Preeti Kumar Examiner Art Unit 1751

PK